ARTICLE

An intersectional approach to understanding how race and social class affect intergroup processes

Samantha L. Moore-Berg[1,2] ⬤ | Andrew Karpinski[3]

[1] University of Pennsylvania

[2] Beyond Conflict Innovation Lab

[3] Temple University

Correspondence
Samantha L. Moore-Berg, Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania, 3620 Walnut St., Philadelphia, PA 19104.
Email: samantha.mooreberg@asc.upenn.edu

Abstract

Much of the current psychological literature investigates single category dimensions (i.e., race or social class), with little focus on the intersection of multiple social category dimensions. Yet some evidence suggests that the intersection of race and social class information influences (a) stereotype expression, (b) categorization, (c) impressions, (d) prejudice, and (e) discrimination, revealing common links between Blackness and low social class and Whiteness and high social class in at least the United States. The present article reviews evidence for considering both target race and social class as intersecting social categories that simultaneously influence intergroup processes. This analysis suggests that a more comprehensive understanding of intergroup processes can be achieved when considering the intersection of race and social class information. This review also provides a series of future directions to advance intergroup processes research.

1 | INTRODUCTION

"The stereotype of the working-class Black or impoverished Black is one that Whites, as well as Blacks, have come to embrace and accept as an accurate and complete account of the Black American experience." Lawrence Otis Graham (1999)

In his book *Whistling Vivaldi*: *How Stereotypes Affect Us and What We Can Do*, Claude Steele (2010) recounts a story told by Brent Staples, an African American reporter. Oftentimes while on nighttime strolls through a park, Staples noticed White passersby who looked uneasy. They clutched their purses, avoided making eye contact, and carefully altered their paths to eliminate potential contact with Staples; they were undoubtedly uncomfortable with the presence of a Black man wandering through the park alone at night. In an attempt to rid them of their concerns, Staples began whistling Vivaldi. He used Vivaldi's compositions to signal that there was no need to be afraid—he was

educated and nonviolent. Within moments, Staples noticed drastic changes in the expressions and body language of the passersby. No longer did they feel threatened. No longer did they attempt avoidance. No longer did they perceive Staples as just a Black man. He was now an upper class Black man.

Incidences like this one are not unusual as stereotypes linking race to social class have long persisted across many societies. In the United States, for example, the confounding nature of race and social class dates back to the early days of slavery (Plous & Williams, 1995), which fueled racial economic inequality. As centuries passed, racial economic inequality persisted, contrary to current misperceptions that the wealth gap between Blacks and Whites has gotten smaller over time (Kraus, Rucker, & Richeson, 2017). Decades of research on group dominance can explain the reinforcement of this racial economic stratification, with dominant groups reinforcing this stratification to maintain their group's high status in society (e.g., Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). However, despite the impact of the intersection of race and social class for interactions with others, much scholarly attention has been devoted to how singular social categories (i.e., race or social class) influence intergroup processes, with less attention to how the intersection of these social categories (i.e., race and social class) influence intergroup processes. In order to develop a more comprehensive understanding of the effect of social categories on intergroup processes, it is important to consider their intersection. In this review, we advocate for an intersectional approach (i.e., considering how multiple social categories interact simultaneously) to race and social class by examining how race and social class intersect to influence a variety of intergroup processes including stereotypes, attitudes, cognition, and behaviors. We build this review upon recent calls for and renewed interest in understanding the intersection between race and social class for intergroup processes (e.g., Brannon, Higginbotham, & Henderson, 2017; Brannon & Markus, 2013; Kraus, Rucker, et al., 2017; Mattan, Kubota, & Cloutier, 2017; Mattan, Kubota, Dang, & Cloutier, 2018; Richeson & Sommers, 2016).

We begin with an analysis of studies that have indirectly examined social class in the context of race studies and of studies that have directly examined how the intersection of race and social class information affects various intergroup processes. This first section is divided into several subsections: how the intersection of race and social class affects (a) stereotypes, (b) categorization, (c) impressions, and (d) prejudice and discrimination. Across these four subsections, we argue that the intersection of race and social class influences a variety of social cognitive and intergroup processes, and we provide theoretical accounts to explain why the intersection of social class and race affects such processes. In the second section, we provide suggestions for future directions in the interest of advancing research on this topic in the field of intergroup processes research.

Even though there are social class stereotypes associated with most racial groups, this review primarily focuses on social class stereotypes about Blacks and Whites given the breadth of literature regarding these two social groups. Much of the literature reviewed in the current article was conducted in the United States and is therefore largely specific to the American social cultural context. In instances when a non-United States sample was used, we clarify the country and contextualize the sample. Likewise, we consider the term *race* to be a social, rather than biological, construct and use this term throughout the review given its use as a predominant descriptor in the studies cited. Given the complexity of social class, here we define *social class* as a person's place in a social hierarchy and as comprised of occupational status, household income, educational attainment, and parental education (Kraus, Park, & Tan, 2017; Tablante & Fiske, 2015). When possible, we clarify the operationalization of social class in the studies reviewed. Lastly, we refer to *intersectionality* as the overlap and interaction of multiple social categories that influence social cognitive and intergroup processes.

This review is situated in the larger framework of intersectionality and multiple social categories literature that calls for the investigation of intersecting social categories for psychological processes (e.g., Cole, 2009; Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015; Purdie-Vaughns & Eibach, 2008; Remedios & Snyder, 2015; Roccas & Brewer, 2002; Warner, 2008). It recognizes the complexities of social cognitive processes during interactions and emphasizes how the interpretation of social categories largely depends on their intersections with other social categories. We draw heavily from past intersectionality theoretical frameworks that focus on the intersection of multiple identities (for reviews, see Crisp & Hewstone, 2007, and Kang & Bodenhausen, 2015), and this past scholarly work more broadly

serves as a foundation from which to enhance the understanding of the specific influence of race and social class on various social cognitive and intergroup processes. However, rather than focus on the overlap between multiple social identities or on multiple categorization of social categories, we take a cross-categorization approach to race and social class intersectionality. We contend that perceivers attend to both race and social class simultaneously when making group-level judgments and decisions, thereby creating dual outgroups rather than one shared outgroup identity.

2 | AN INTERSECTIONAL APPROACH TO RACE AND SOCIAL CLASS

Determining how the intersection of race and social class information influences various intergroup processes has long captivated researchers' curiosity. Classic social psychological texts, such as Allport's (1954) *The Nature of Prejudice*, highlight how the conjunction of race and social class can affect prejudiced attitudes. Similarly, Pettigrew (1981) called for an interactive model in which researchers would "expect racial phenomena to operate differently across the social class lines within both Black and White America. Likewise, class-linked phenomena will often vary according to race" (p. 244). In this section of the review, we provide evidence for studies that have directly manipulated both race and social class as well as studies that have inadvertently uncovered social class stereotypes in race studies.

2.1 | Race and social class: Stereotyping

Social psychological research has devoted much attention to understanding race and social class stereotypes. Traditionally, Blacks have been stereotyped as unintelligent, hostile, lazy, poor, violent, and dishonest (e.g., Brown, Boniecki, & Walters, 2004; Devine, 1989; Devine & Elliot, 1995; Katz & Braly, 1933; Klonis, 2005; Niemann, Jennings, Rozelle, Baxter, & Sullivan, 1994; Spencer, Fein, Wolfe, Fong, & Dunn, 1998; Tan, Zhang, Zhang, & Dalisay, 2009), whereas Whites have been stereotyped as intelligent, motivated, wealthy, and productive (Dasgupta, McGhee, Greenwald, & Banaji, 2000; Klonis, 2005; Niemann et al., 1994). For social class stereotypes, poor people have been stereotyped as untrustworthy, incompetent, dishonest, lazy, unintelligent, and disinterested in self-improvement (Bullock, 1999; Cozzarelli, Wilkinson, & Tagler, 2001; Durante, Tablante, & Fiske, 2017; Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002; Spencer & Castano, 2007), whereas upper class/wealthy people have been stereotyped as cold and competent (Durante et al., 2017; Fiske et al., 2002; Wu, Bai, & Fiske, 2018).

A closer analysis of stereotype studies reveals that many of the stereotypes traditionally associated with Blacks are also associated with the poor (e.g., unintelligent, lazy) and many of the stereotypes associated with Whites are also associated with the affluent (e.g., educated and well-spoken). For instance, when asked to recall descriptors of Blacks, participants use the terms "ghetto Black" and "welfare Black" more frequently than they use the term "businessman Black" (Devine & Baker, 1991; McCabe & Brannon, 2004). Similarly, participants describe Whites as "educated," "intelligent," and "affluent" but describe Blacks as "poor" and "live in poor areas" (Bobo & Massagli, 2001; Bonam, Bergsieker, & Eberhardt, 2016; Bonam, Yantis, & Taylor, 2018; Katz & Braly, 1933). Indeed, these results suggest that traditional stereotypes about Whites resemble upper class stereotypes and traditional stereotypes associated with Blacks reflect lower class stereotypes, at least in the United States.

Evidence from Social Role Theory (Eagly, 1987) corroborates the overlap between race and social class stereotypes. Social Role Theory postulates that perceivers' beliefs about social groups reflect "experiences with group members in their typical social roles—that is, in roles in which these group members are overrepresented relative to their numbers in the general population" (Koenig & Eagly, 2014, p. 372). Accordingly, if people commonly observe or hear about Black people in low-income jobs or facing poverty and White people in high-income jobs or experiencing financial success, then Blackness and low social class and Whiteness and high social class will undoubtedly become confounded in a person's mind. For example, images of the Black urban poor have dominated depictions of poor people in the media (Bullock, Wyche, & Williams, 2001) and literature (Swindler Boutte, Hopkins, & Waklatsi,

2008), which has led to the gross overestimation of Black people facing poverty. This media and literature portrayal of the relationship between poverty and race perpetuates the erroneous perception that most poor people are Black. If the media consistently overrepresents Black people as poor and underrepresents White people as poor, people are likely to develop stereotypic associations between Black people and poverty and between White people and affluence. Thus, when either social class or race information is missing, preexisting Black-poor and White-rich automatic stereotypes will likely be activated.

However, when race and social class are both specified, there is reason to anticipate that stereotypes change. In fact, stereotypes associated with upper and lower class Blacks and Whites vary more as a function of social class than race. When both race and social class are specified, stereotypes typically associated with Whites (e.g., intelligent, ambitious, and industrious) are associated with upper class Blacks and upper class Whites. Likewise, stereotypes traditionally associated with Blacks (e.g., lazy, unreliable, and ignorant) are associated with lower class Blacks and lower class Whites (Bayton, McAllister, & Hamer, 1956; Smedley & Bayton, 1978). When only race is specified, for example, Blacks are viewed as lower in warmth and competence than Whites. Yet this relationship changes when social class is also known. Black professionals are stereotyped as high in competence and moderate in warmth, whereas poor Whites and poor Blacks are stereotyped as low in competence and warmth (Fiske et al., 2002). Although specific attention has not been given to White professionals, it is reasonable to assume that warmth and competence stereotypes associated with Whites (i.e., high warmth and competence) also represent stereotypes about the White professional subgroup. Thus, the presence of social class greatly impacts the activation and suppression of traditional race stereotypes.

2.2 | Race and social class: Categorization

In addition to shaping racial stereotypes, social class information also plays a pivotal role in how people interpret and remember racial categorizations of themselves and others (e.g., Cole & Omari, 2003; Penner & Saperstein, 2008; Telles, 2002; Telles & Lim, 1998). According to the Dynamic Interactive Theory (Freeman & Ambady, 2011), perceptions of others are influenced by the interaction between social categories, stereotypes, high-level cognitive states (e.g., perception and motivation), and low-level person perceptions (e.g., facial cues). Multiple categories (both focal and nonfocal categories) are cognitively activated simultaneously, which subsequently influences top-down and bottom-up perceptions of others. Thus, when race categories become salient, nonfocal categories—such as social class—can exert influence on person construal and perception. For example, when presented with a racially ambiguous face, the racial categorization of the face can be swayed by other activated, nonfocal categories, including social class. Similarly, priming concepts related to economic scarcity increases the tendency of (a) categorizing mixed-race faces as Black rather than as White, (b) visualizing Blacks as darker in complexion, and (c) viewing Blacks as possessing more prototypically Black features (Krosch & Amodio, 2014). Here, the activation of both focal race categories alongside nonfocal social class categories influence the visualization and categorization of faces.

Further, the speed of categorization is directly impacted by stereotype-consistent focal and nonfocal race and social class categories. That is, categorization is much faster when a Black face is paired with low-status clothing and a White face is paired with high-status clothing, and much slower when a Black face is paired with high-status clothing and a White face is paired with low-status clothing (Freeman, Penner, Saperstein, Scheutz, & Ambady, 2011). It could be that categorization speed is influenced by underlying mental representations. For instance, mental representations of low social class people and welfare recipients tend to look African American, whereas mental representations of high social class people and non-welfare recipients tend to look White (e.g., Brown-Iannuzzi, Dotsch, Cooley, & Payne, 2017; Fox, 2004; Lei & Bodenhausen, 2017). Together these findings highlight how the activation of both focal and nonfocal social categories influence the categorization, visualization, and mental representations of individuals in stereotype-consistent ways.

The dynamic activation and deactivation of focal and nonfocal cues can be further applied to the processing of high- and low-status faces. In general, people are better at processing and remembering high-status faces than low-status faces (Ratcliff, Hugenberg, Shriver, & Bernstein, 2011). In the context of intersectionality, when specifying race and social class, White people demonstrate better recognition of faces presented in rich contexts than in poor contexts. In fact, recognition of White faces in impoverished settings is equally as poor as the recognition of Black faces in both impoverished and wealthy settings (Shriver, Young, Hugenberg, Bernstein, & Lanter, 2008). However, this effect slightly changes in goal-relevant situations, such as when the target has or exerts high power. Specifically, people demonstrate an increase in cross-race face recognition when the person holds occupational power—people demonstrate increased facial recognition when cross-race people hold high status positions such as CEO or doctor (Study 1; Shriver & Hugenberg, 2010). These patterns of results are different from race only face recognition studies, which find that people more easily recognize faces of their own race rather than faces of other races (Meissner & Brigham, 2001). Here, the status of the person drives face processing, which is paramount to the construction of impression of others.

Importantly, the activation of race and social class categories extends to more overt categorization behaviors as well. For instance, research reveals that social mobility influences race perceptions of others. That is, when interviewers were tasked with assessing the race of respondents, they were more likely to classify people who live below the poverty line, who were unemployed, or who were imprisoned as Black than as White. For respondents who moved downward in social status over time, interviewers were also more likely to categorize these respondents as Black than as White, even if they were initially categorized as White and self-identified as White. The same pattern exists for upward social status mobility: respondents moving upward in social status were more likely to be categorized as White than as Black, even if previously categorized as Black and self-identified as Black (Penner & Saperstein, 2008). Thus, people are less likely to be identified as Black and more likely to be identified as White as status increases, confirming that race and social class interact to influence categorization. Additionally, this tendency to categorize high social class people as White (even if they self-identify as Black) and to categorize low social class people as Black (even if they self-identify as White) perpetuates the race by social class stereotype. These interviewer biases extend beyond United States samples as researchers found similar results in Brazilian samples (Telles, 2002; Telles & Lim, 1998).

Across this research, it is clear that both focal and nonfocal race and social class categories are activated simultaneously to influence categorization processes. In fact, whether social class or race drives these processes is largely influenced by stereotypic associations. For instance, during spontaneous categorization of targets, race dominates categorization in stereotype consistent race-class associations (i.e., low class Blacks), but social class influences categorization in stereotype-inconsistent race-class associations (i.e., middle class Blacks; Weeks & Lupfer, 2004). These studies indicate that the direction of effects during social categorization can be largely informed by the race and social class stereotype literature.

2.3 | Race and social class: Impressions

Beyond categorization processes, a variety of research demonstrates fluctuations in racial biases in the presence of social class indicators (e.g., Feldman & Hilterman, 1974; Jussim, Coleman, & Lerch, 1987; Westie, 1952; Westie & Howard, 1954). For example, occupational prestige and target clothing affects initial impressions and subsequent desired social distance toward Black targets. White respondents demonstrate lower levels of desired social distance as Black targets' occupational prestige increased (Feldman & Hilterman, 1974; Westie, 1952) and White job evaluators rate upper class Blacks more positively than similar Whites and lower class Blacks (Jussim et al., 1987). This effect extends to impressions of potential neighbors. When asked to rate White, Black, and Hispanic potential neighbors, participants demonstrated greater animosity toward neighbors who received public assistance than toward neighbors who inherited or earned their income. Potential neighbor preference showed no correlation with

measures of racism, suggesting that target social class played a more pivotal role on judgments than target race (Kirby, 1999). In other words, if both social class and race are known, these findings suggest that social class biases are not merely driven by race biases alone.

Such effects could be explained by the Parallel-Constraint-Satisfaction Theory (Kunda & Thagard, 1996). This theory proposes a connectionist model—stereotypes, traits, and behaviors are represented as interconnected nodes of spreading activation. Such nodes can both activate and deactivate each other depending on the situation and context, causing impression formation to be the result of the integration of observed information and previously activated knowledge. Ingrained in many social situations is information about social class, therefore, the parallel activation of social class and racial information is inherent to the activation or deactivation of associated stereotypes. For example, as demonstrated previously, Black people are more likely to be associated with *ghetto* than *businessman* (Devine & Baker, 1991), which derives associated traits such as aggression and violence. Yet when a person encounters a well-dressed Black man, social status (as conveyed through attire) suppresses the *ghetto* association while simultaneously activating the *businessman* association, which inhibits the aggressive subtype (Kunda & Thagard, 1996). Put simply, the activation of individuating status information undermines associated stereotypes, which ultimately affects impression formation.

2.4 | Race and social class: Prejudice and discrimination

Emerging evidence suggests that race and social class interact to affect prejudice and discrimination outcomes (e.g., Jussim et al., 1987; Tapia, 2010; Weeks, Weeks, & Frost, 2007). When asked to decide how much of a raise a person should receive in experimental settings, race interacted with social class to influence outcomes for Black employees. That is, low social class Black employees received a larger percentage raise than did upper middle class Black employees. Social class did not influence the raise received for White employees (Weeks et al., 2007). The authors suggest that overcompensation for racial biases led to a higher raise for low class Black employees and that this need for overcompensation subsequently went away when faced with Black employees with higher social prestige. Here low social class Black employees were discriminated against less than their high social class Black counterparts.

Yet the influence of race coupled with social prestige does not end with salary discrimination. In general, high-status group members are prejudiced against low-status group members and discriminate against them (e.g., Hornsey & Hogg, 2002; Lott, 2012). This effect can be moderated by situational factors including perceived threat to racial in-group, political power, and feelings of prestige. That is, as perceived threats to White peoples' identity, political power, and social prestige increases, discrimination against low-status in-group members (Kunstman, Plant, & Deska, 2016) and low- and high-status outgroup members also increases (Craig & Richeson, 2014; Dover, Major, & Kaiser, 2016; Richeson & Ambady, 2003). For instance, research suggests that White people perceive low social class Whites as status threats to the prestige of their in-group and physically distance themselves from low-status White interaction partners. Therefore, White people are motivated to psychologically and physically distance themselves from low-status in-group members (i.e., low social class Whites; Kunstman et al., 2016), and as a consequence, in-group members could be ostracized by other in-group members or experience the "black sheep effect" (i.e., in-group members who violate race-class stereotypes could experience more extreme negative evaluations than outgroup members who also violate race-class stereotypes; Marques, Yzerbyt, & Leyens, 1988). Thus, being White might not be sufficient enough to protect low-social class Whites from being derogated by in-group members.

The impact of social class on racial prejudice and discrimination extends to shooter bias paradigms as well. Traditional shooter bias research reveals that participants demonstrate more shooter bias for Black suspects than White suspects (e.g., Correll, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2002; Plant & Peruche, 2005). Yet when suspect social class is specified (via clothing type) in addition to suspect race, a different pattern of results emerge. Specifically, participants demonstrate more shooter bias toward rich Blacks than rich Whites and no significant differences in shooting decisions between poor Whites and poor Blacks. Thus, participants respond similarly toward poor Whites, poor

Blacks, and rich Blacks and uniquely toward rich Whites (Moore-Berg, Karpinski, & Plant, 2017). This pattern of results mirrors other shooter bias research that alters suspect race and the type of neighborhood (i.e., dangerous or safe) that the suspect is shown in (Correll, Wittenbrink, Park, Judd, & Goyle, 2011).

2.5 | Race and social class: Summary

Across these studies, it is clear that race and social class interact to influence various intergroup processes, with stereotypic associations informing the direction of effects for many of the social cognitive and intergroup processes discussed. When race and social class information is matched in stereotype-conforming ways, various social cognitive processes work more quickly and/or improve. For instance, the speed of categorization increases (Freeman, Penner, Saperstein, Scheutz, & Ambady, 2011) and the memory for faces improves (Shriver et al., 2008). The opposite pattern occurs for stereotype non-conforming race and social class pairs—social cognitive processes slow or get worse. In light of this, there are benefits for breaking race by social class stereotypes, especially for high-status Blacks; for example, social distancing decreases when faced with a high-status Black person (Feldman & Hilterman, 1974; Westie, 1952). However, these effects do not hold for Whites who break the high-status White stereotype—low status Whites face much animosity from in-group members (Kunstman et al., 2016). The implications for these effects reveal the complexity of the intersection of race and social class for intergroup behaviors.

3 | FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The goal of the present review was to reveal how the intersection of race and social class information affects intergroup processes. It is clear from this research that information about both race and social class leads to variations in stereotypes, categorization, impressions, prejudice, and discrimination. Moreover, the absence of race or social class information gives way to inferences about either social class or race categories, causing stereotypes about race and social class to influence attitudes and decision-making in often-erroneous ways. Given the current literature on the intersection of race and social class research, here we provide a series of future directions and testable hypotheses in the interest of advancing the field of intergroup processes research.

3.1 | Reexamination of past race and social class intersectionality research

Over the past several decades, the types of group stereotypes people endorse have significantly changed (Madon et al., 2001)—possibly due to changes in social roles (e.g., Eagly & Steffen, 1984), the structure of intergroup relationships, and/or intergroup contact (e.g., Linville, Fischer, & Salovey, 1989). Therefore, reassessment of current day race by social class stereotypes is needed as many of the stereotype studies cited in this review were conducted over 30 years ago and highlight stereotypes that are less commonly used today. In the 1950s, for example, people commonly used the term "superstitious" to describe lower class Blacks and lower class Whites (Bayton et al., 1956). Yet more recent research reveals that terms such as "superstitious" are outdated. Rather, people are more likely to use status-based stereotypes (e.g., stereotypes regarding education level, occupation, and total wealth) to describe low and high social class White and Black people. An improved understanding of the content of current stereotypes will clarify the role of race and social class intersectionality during intergroup processes.

3.2 | Individual differences analyses

Examination of individual differences serves as another future direction of this intersectionality research. Social psychological theories related to group dominance, including Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1969; Tajfel, Billig, Bundy, & Flament, 1971; Tajfel & Turner, 1986), Social Dominance Theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), and System

Justification Theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994), suggest that high status people seek to maintain their group's high status in society (e.g., Jost et al., 2004; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999; Tajfel & Turner, 1986). Briefly, Social Identity Theory asserts that people sort others rapidly into "us" versus "them" categories, which fosters in-group favoritism and motivation to protect in-group status. Members of high-status groups focus on maintaining group superiority and therefore, rely on discriminatory practices to ensure group dominance (Richeson & Sommers, 2016; Tajfel, 1969; Tajfel et al., 1971). Similarly, Social Dominance Theory suggests that people organize themselves into group-based hierarchies in which the dominant group typically disproportionately allocates resources to in-group members to maintain group power and status in the hierarchy (Richeson & Sommers, 2016; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). System Justification Theory proposes that people rely on stereotypes to defend and legitimize existing power and status hierarchies (Jost & Banaji, 1994). As evidenced by each of these theories, people who endorse group dominance implement discriminatory practices, allocate resources unequally, and/or perpetuate (often inaccurate) stereotypes about subordinate groups in order to maintain group status. Therefore, confounding race with social class stereotypes and using target race and social class as caveats for discriminatory practices could be ways that superordinate group members maintain and legitimize their high status at the individual level and societal/contextual level. Further examination of how group dominance moderates race by social class stereotype perpetuation and discrimination is needed to understand which types of people are most likely to engage in biased behaviors (both in-group favoritism and outgroup derogation).

3.3 | Methodological implications of race-social class intersectionality

Underlying status indicators (e.g., social class) not directly manipulated or controlled for by the researcher could act as extraneous variables that affect participant responding. People hold stereotypic assumptions about race when only social class is known and about social class when only race is known. Specifically, when people think of a Black person, they might picture a low class person (or vice versa), and when people think of a White person, they might picture a high class person (or vice versa). Thus, Whiteness has come to be associated with high social class, and Blackness has come to be associated with low social class. As a consequence, when race or social class is unknown, people fill in the missing information with stereotypes and rely on automatic mental representations (Brown-Iannuzzi et al., 2017; Lei & Bodenhausen, 2017). Such indicators may be understood as organized Gestalts given that single status indicators never appear isolated in the real world (Landrine, 1985), suggesting that participants might not be able to make assessments based on race without assigning social class to the target. Therefore, the investigation of racial stereotypes that does not account for social class can ultimately yield ambiguous results (Jones, 1972). This limitation makes it difficult to conclusively discern if basic intergroup processes (i.e., stereotyping, prejudice, categorization, and impression formation) are a result of target race, target social class, or a combination of both target race and social class.

A skeptical reader might argue that researchers do control for social class during race studies by using only pictures of faces or stereotypical names during experimentation. Classic implicit associations studies, for example, use stereotypically White and Black names or zoomed in pictures of faces to eliminate extraneous confounds (see Greenwald, McGhee, & Schwartz, 1998; Nosek et al., 2007; and Quillian, 2006, for examples). However, faces and names might prime social class—an invisible social category that cannot be seen, recognized, or processed in this context—given that race and social class are stereotypically intertwined. This limitation could threaten the internal validity of the single category experimental designs if the invisible social category (i.e., social class) influences responses in ways unbeknownst to the researcher. On the other hand, if the interaction between the invisible social class cues and race reflects realistic contexts, then the study will have external validity. Both of these issues require the researcher to be cognizant of the role of invisible social class cues during race studies. To circumvent this issue, researchers should consider clarifying target social class or asking participants to make judgments about the social class of the target at the conclusion of the experiment to account for this variable in the analysis. Similarly, social class

researchers should ask participants if they associate the targets with specific racial groups, assuming that the racial group is not explicitly stated or visually apparent. (For additional suggestions for incorporating race-social class intersectionality into quantitative research, see Else-Quest & Hyde, 2016.) Despite these suggestions, researchers might not want to remove social class from race analyses and race from social class analyses. Social class and race rarely appear isolated in the real world so eliminating or controlling for one of these social categories could reduce the real world application and ecological validity of the research.

3.4 | Broadening the scope of race and social class research

As mentioned in the introduction, a majority of the research reviewed was conducted in the United States, with only a couple of studies examining how race and social class intersectionality affects non-U.S. samples (e.g., Telles, 2002; Telles & Lim, 1998). However, it is likely that race and social class intersectionality exists and has similar effects on intergroup processes in societies across the globe. Status hierarchies can be informative for understanding which social class stereotypes are ascribed to which races in other nations, and theories—such as the Social Role Theory (Eagly, 1987)—can provide explanations for how such stereotypes transpired. Additionally, previously described group dominance theories—such as Social Identity Theory (Tajfel, 1969; Tajfel et al., 1971), Social Dominance Theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), and System Justification Theory (Jost & Banaji, 1994)—can also shed light onto how race and social class stereotypes transpire and influence intergroup processes in other nations. To the extent that group hierarchies and dominance are innate human conditions, other cultures/societies will undoubtedly have race-social class associations and use racial economic stratification to reinforce societal-level group hierarchies. This global approach to race and social class intersectionality will allow for comparisons of how these social categories interact to affect intergroup processes in varying societies.

Likewise, broadening the scope of the racial groups studied beyond White and Black race subgroups will provide a deeper understanding of intergroup processes. Few studies have examined how other races/ethnicities interact with social class to influence intergroup processes. Studies that have branched out beyond Black–White comparisons have found that social class moderates discrimination outcomes for other ethnic groups as well. As one example, low social class Hispanics are likely to receive longer and harsher criminal sentences than middle or high social class Hispanics (Espinoza & Willis-Esqueda, 2015; Esqueda, Espinoza, & Culhane, 2008). It could be that these effects can be applied to other marginalized racial group members who face low levels of social class. Continued examination of the intersection of other races with social class will shed light on how other groups are stereotyped, categorized, and discriminated against.

Further, other social categories (gender, religion, sexual orientation, and political identity) may also intersect to influence intergroup behaviors (e.g., Bowleg, 2008; Penner & Saperstein, 2013; Remedios & Snyder, 2018; Warner & Shields, 2013). A broader approach to this intersectionality research would build upon historical and cultural contexts to understand the confounding nature of other social categories. As a result, current theoretical approaches to understanding social cognitive and intergroup processes—such as perception, categorization, prejudice, and discrimination—can be enhanced by integrating information about multiple complex social identities.

4 | CODA

Interest in research investigating the complexity of race by social class stereotypes is emerging as an important future direction of social psychological research (e.g., Brannon et al., 2017; Brannon & Markus, 2013; Kraus, Rucker, et al., 2017; Mattan et al., 2017; Mattan et al., 2018; Richeson & Sommers, 2016). Continued investigation of the effects of race and social class on intergroup processes will supplement the current literature by elaborating on many effects previously attributed to only race or only social class. In the current review, we focus on a sample of ways to investigate race and social class as intersecting social categories as well as provide evidence for the significant role

that both categories play on stereotypes, attitudes, categorization, impressions, behaviors, and interactions. Ultimately considering social class when examining attitudes toward race and race when examining attitudes toward social class will help enhance our understanding of intergroup processes.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

ORCID

Samantha L. Moore-Berg https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2972-2288

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice. Oxford, England*Addison-Wesley.

Bayton, J. A., McAllister, L. B., & Hamer, J. (1956). Race-class stereotypes. *Journal Of Negro Education*, *25*, 75–78. https://doi.org/10.2307/2293141

Bobo, L. D., & Massagli, M. P. (2001). Stereotypes and urban inequality. In *Urban inequality: Evidence from four cities* (pp. 82–169). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Bonam, C., Yantis, C., & Taylor, V. J. (2018). Invisible middle-class Black space: Asymmetrical person and space stereotyping at the race–class nexus. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. https://doi.org/10.1177/1368430218784189

Bonam, C. M., Bergsieker, H. B., & Eberhardt, J. L. (2016). Polluting Black space. *Journal of Experimental Psychology. General*, *145*(11), 1548–1560. doi: 2101/10.1037/xge0000226

Bowleg, L. (2008). When Black + Lesbian + Woman ≠ Black Lesbian Woman: The methodological challenges of qualitative and quantitative intersectionality research. Sex Roles, 59(5–6), 312–325. https://proxy.library.upenn.edu:2101/10.1007/s11199-008-9400-z

Brannon, T. N., Higginbotham, G. D., & Henderson, K. (2017). Class advantages and disadvantages are not so Black and White: Intersectionality impacts rank and selves. *Current Opinion In Psychology*, *18*, 117–122. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.08.029

Brannon, T. N., & Markus, H. R. (2013). Social class and race: Burdens but also some benefits of chronic low rank. *Psychological Inquiry*, *24*(2), 97–101. https://doi.org/10.1080/1047840X.2013.794102

Brown, L. M., Boniecki, K. A., & Walters, A. M. (2004). Intergroup flexibility and people's views of African Americans. *International Journal Of Intercultural Relations*, *28*(5), 373–398. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2004.08.001

Brown-Iannuzzi, J. L., Dotsch, R., Cooley, E., & Payne, B. K. (2017). The relationship between mental representations of welfare recipients and attitudes toward welfare. *Psychological Science*, *28*(1), 92–103. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616674999

Bullock, H. E. (1999). Attributions for poverty: A comparison of middle-class and welfare recipient attitudes. *Journal Of Applied Social Psychology*, *29*(10), 2059–2082. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1999.tb02295.x

Bullock, H. E., Wyche, K. F., & Williams, W. R. (2001). Media images of the poor. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*(2), 229–246. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00210

Cole, E. R. (2009). Intersectionality and research in psychology. *American Psychologist*, *64*(3), 170–180. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0014564

Cole, E. R., & Omari, S. R. (2003). Race, class and the dilemmas of upward mobility for African Americans. *Journal Of Social Issues*, *59*(4), 785–802. https://doi.org/10.1046/j.0022-4537.2003.00090.x

Correll, J., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Wittenbrink, B. (2002). The police officer's dilemma: Using ethnicity to disambiguate potentially threatening individuals. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *83*(6), 1314–1329. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.83.6.1314

Correll, J., Wittenbrink, B., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Goyle, A. (2011). Dangerous enough: Moderating racial bias with contextual threat cues. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology*, *47*(1), 184–189. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.08.017

Cozzarelli, C., Wilkinson, A. V., & Tagler, M. J. (2001). Attitudes toward the poor and attributions for poverty. *Journal Of Social Issues*, *57*(2), 207–227. https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00209

Craig, M. A., & Richeson, J. A. (2014). On the precipice of a 'majority-minority' America: Perceived status threat from the racial demographic shift affects White Americans' political ideology. *Psychological Science*, *25*(6), 1189–1197. https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797614527113

Crisp, R. J., & Hewstone, M. (2007). Multiple social categorization. In M. P. Zanna, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (ed., Vol. 39) (pp. 163–254). San Diego, CA, US: Elsevier Academic Press. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0065-2601(06)39004-1

Dasgupta, N., McGhee, D. E., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2000). Automatic preference for White Americans: Eliminating the familiarity explanation. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology*, *36*(3), 316–328. https://doi.org/10.1006/jesp.1999.1418

Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *56*(1), 5–18. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.56.1.5

Devine, P. G., & Baker, S. M. (1991). Measurement of racial stereotype subtyping. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *17*(1), 44–50. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167291171007

Devine, P. G., & Elliot, A. J. (1995). Are racial stereotypes really fading? The Princeton trilogy revisited. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *21*(11), 1139–1150. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672952111002

Dover, T. L., Major, B., & Kaiser, C. R. (2016). Members of high-status groups are threatened by pro-diversity organizational messages. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology*, *62*, 58–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2015.10.006

Durante, F., Tablante, C. B., & Fiske, S. T. (2017). Poor but warm, rich but cold (and competent): Social classes in the stereotype content model. *Journal Of Social Issues*, *73*(1), 138–157. https://doi.org/10.1111/josi.12208

Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences social behavior: A social-role analysis*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1984). Gender stereotypes stem from the distribution of women and men into social roles. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *46*(4), 735–754. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.46.4.735

Else-Quest, N. M., & Hyde, J. S. (2016). Intersectionality in quantitative psychological research. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, *40*(3), 319–336. doi:2101/10.1177/0361684316647953

Espinoza, R. E., & Willis-Esqueda, C. (2015). The influence of mitigation evidence, ethnicity, and SES on death penalty decisions by European American and Latino venire persons. *Cultural Diversity And Ethnic Minority Psychology*, *21*(2), 288–299. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037646

Esqueda, C. W., Espinoza, R. E., & Culhane, S. E. (2008). The effects of ethnicity, SES, and crime status on juror decision making: A cross-cultural examination of European American and Mexican American mock jurors. *Hispanic Journal Of Behavioral Sciences*, *30*(2), 181–199. https://doi.org/10.1177/0739986308315319

Feldman, J. M., & Hilterman, R. J. (1974). Stereotype attribution revisited: The role of stimulus characteristics, racial attitude, and cognitive differentiation. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *1*(1), 62–65. https://doi.org/10.1177/014616727400100121

Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *82*(6), 878–902. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.878

Fox, C. (2004). The changing color of welfare? How Whites' attitudes toward Latinos influence support for welfare. *American Journal Of Sociology*, *110*(3), 580–625. https://doi.org/10.1086/422587

Freeman, J. B., & Ambady, N. (2011). A dynamic interactive theory of person construal. *Psychological Review*, *118*, 247–279. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022327

Freeman, J. B., Penner, A. M., Saperstein, A., Scheutz, M., & Ambady, N. (2011). Looking the part: Social status cues shape race perception. *PLoS ONE*, *6*(9), e25107. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0025107

Graham, L. O. (1999). *Our kind of people: Inside America's Black upper class*. New York, New York: Harper Perennial.

Greenwald, A. G., McGhee, D. E., & Schwartz, J. K. (1998). Measuring individual differences in implicit cognition: The implicit association test. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *74*(6), 1464–1480. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.6.1464

Hornsey, M. J., & Hogg, M. A. (2002). The effects of status on subgroup relations. *British Journal Of Social Psychology*, *41*(2), 203–218. https://doi.org/10.1348/014466602760060200

Jones, J. M. (1972). *Prejudice and racism*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Jost, J. T., & Banaji, M. R. (1994). The role of stereotyping in system-justification and the production of false consciousness. *British Journal Of Social Psychology*, *33*(1), 1–27. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-8309.1994.tb01008.x

Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, *25*(6), 881–919. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9221.2004.00402.x

Jussim, L., Coleman, L. M., & Lerch, L. (1987). The nature of stereotypes: A comparison and integration of three theories. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *52*(3), 536–546. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.52.3.536

Kang, S. K., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2015). Multiple identities in social perception and interaction: Challenges and opportunities. *Annual Review Of Psychology*, *66*, 547–574. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015025

Katz, D., & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *The Journal Of Abnormal And Social Psychology*, *28*(3), 280–290. https://doi.org/10.1037/h0074049

Kirby, B. J. (1999). Income source and race effects on new-neighbor evaluations. *Journal Of Applied Social Psychology*, *29*(7), 1497–1511. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1999.tb00149.x

Klonis, S. C. (2005). The effects of race and socioeconomic status on implicit and explicit stereotypes. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, *65*, 6091.

Koenig, A. M., & Eagly, A. H. (2014). Evidence for the social role theory of stereotype content: Observations of groups' roles shape stereotypes. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *107*(3), 371–392. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0037215

Kraus, M. W., Park, J. W., & Tan, J. X. (2017). Signs of social class: The experience of economic inequality in everyday life. *Perspectives On Psychological Science*, *12*(3), 422–435. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616673192

Kraus, M. W., Rucker, J. M., & Richeson, J. A. (2017). Americans misperceive racial economic equality. *PNAS Proceedings Of The National Academy Of Sciences Of The United States Of America*, *114*(39), 10324–10331. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1707719114

Krosch, A. R., & Amodio, D. M. (2014). Economic scarcity alters the perception of race. *PNAS Proceedings Of The National Academy Of Sciences Of The United States Of America*, *111*(25), 9079–9084. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.1404448111

Kunda, Z., & Thagard, P. (1996). Forming impressions from stereotypes, traits, and behaviors: A parallel-constraint-satisfaction theory. *Psychological Review*, *103*(2), 284–308. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-295X.103.2.284

Kunstman, J. W., Plant, E. A., & Deska, J. C. (2016). White ≠ poor: Whites distance, derogate, and deny low-status ingroup members. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *42*(2), 230–243. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167215623270

Landrine, H. (1985). Race × class stereotypes of women. *Sex Roles*, *13*(1–2), 65–75. https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00287461

Lei, R. F., & Bodenhausen, G. V. (2017). Racial assumptions color the mental representation of social class. *Frontiers In Psychology*, *8*.

Linville, P. W., Fischer, G. W., & Salovey, P. (1989). Perceived distributions of the characteristics of in-group and out-group members: Empirical evidence and a computer simulation. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, *57*(2), 165–188. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.57.2.165

Lott, B. (2012). The social psychology of class and classism. *American Psychologist*, *67*(8), 650–658. https://doi.org/10.1037/a0029369

Madon, S., Guyll, M., Aboufadel, K., Montiel, E., Smith, A., Palumbo, P., & Jussim, L. (2001). Ethnic and national stereotypes: The Princeton trilogy revisited and revised. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(8), 996–1010. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201278007

Marques, J. M., Yzerbyt, V. Y., & Leyens, J. (1988). The "black sheep effect": Extremity of judgments towards ingroup members as a function of group identification. *European Journal Of Social Psychology*, *18*(1), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420180102

Mattan, B. D., Kubota, J. T., & Cloutier, J. (2017). How social status shapes person perception and evaluation: A social neuroscience perspective. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *12*(3), 468–507. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691616677828

Mattan, B. D., Kubota, J. T., Dang, T. P., & Cloutier, J. (2018). External motivation to avoid prejudice alters neural responses to targets varying in race and status. *Social Cognitive And Affective Neuroscience*, *13*(1), 22–31. https://doi.org/10.1093/scan/nsx128

McCabe, A. E., & Brannon, L. A. (2004). Effect of shifting standards on evaluations of white subtype members. *The Journal Of Social Psychology*, *144*(1), 91–92. https://doi.org/10.3200/SOCP.144.1.91-92

Meissner, C. A., & Brigham, J. C. (2001). Thirty years of investigating the own-race bias in memory for faces: A meta-analytic review. *Psychology, Public Policy, And Law*, *7*(1), 3–35. https://doi.org/10.1037/1076-8971.7.1.3

Moore-Berg, S., Karpinski, A., & Plant, E. A. (2017). Quick to the draw: How suspect race and socioeconomic status influences shooting decisions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *47*(9), 482–491. https://doi.org/10.1111/jasp.12454

Niemann, Y. F., Jennings, L., Rozelle, R. M., Baxter, J. C., & Sullivan, E. (1994). Use of free responses and cluster analysis to determine stereotypes of eight groups. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 20(4), 379–390. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167294204005

Nosek, B. A., Smyth, F. L., Hansen, J. J., Devos, T., Lindner, N. M., Ratliff (Ranganath), K. A. , Smith, C. T., Olson, K. R., Chugh, D., Greenwald, A. G., & Banaji, M. R. (2007). Pervasiveness and correlates of implicit attitudes and stereotypes. *European Review of Social Psychology*, 18, 36–88.

Penner, A. M., & Saperstein, A. (2008). How social status shapes race. *PNAS Proceedings Of The National Academy Of Sciences Of The United States Of America*, 105(50), 19628–19630. https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.0805762105

Penner, A. M., & Saperstein, A. (2013). Engendering racial perceptions: An intersectional analysis of how social status shapes race. *Gender & Society*, 27(3), 319–344. https://doi.org/10.1177/0891243213480262

Pettigrew, T. F. (1981). Race and class in the 1980s: An interactive view. *Daedalus*, 110, 233–255.

Plant, E. A., & Peruche, B. M. (2005). The consequences of race for police officers' responses to criminal suspects. *Psychological Science*, 16(3), 180–183. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0956-7976.2005.00800.x

Plous, S., & Williams, T. (1995). Racial stereotypes from the days of American slavery: A continuing legacy. *Journal Of Applied Social Psychology*, 25(9), 795–817. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.1995.tb01776.x

Purdie-Vaughns, V., & Eibach, R. (2008). Intersectional invisibility: The distinctive advantages and disadvantages of multiple subordinate-group identities. *Sex Roles*, 59(5–6), 377–391. https://proxy.library.upenn.edu:2101/10.1007/s11199-008-9424-4

Quillian, L. (2006). New approaches to understanding racial prejudice and discrimination. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 32, 299–328. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.soc.32.061604.123132

Ratcliff, N. J., Hugenberg, K., Shriver, E. R., & Bernstein, M. J. (2011). The allure of status: High-status targets are privileged in face processing and memory. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 37(8), 1003–1015. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167211407210

Remedios, J. D., & Snyder, S. H. (2015). Where do we go from here? Toward an inclusive and intersectional literature of multiple stigmatization. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 73(9–10), 408–413. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-015-0543-4

Remedios, J. D., & Snyder, S. H. (2018). Intersectional oppression: Multiple stigmatized identities and perceptions of invisibility, discrimination, and stereotyping. *Journal of Social Issues*, 74(2), 265–281. doi:2101/10.1111/josi.12268

Richeson, J. A., & Ambady, N. (2003). Effects of situational power on automatic racial prejudice. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39(2), 177–183. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0022-1031(02)00521-8

Richeson, J. A., & Sommers, S. R. (2016). Toward a social psychology of race and race relations for the twenty-first century. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 67, 439–463. https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115115

Roccas, S., & Brewer, M. (2002). Social identity complexity. *Personality And Social Psychology Review*, 6(2), 88–106. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327957PSPR0602_01

Shriver, E. R., & Hugenberg, K. (2010). Power, individuation, and the cross-race recognition deficit. *Journal Of Experimental Social Psychology*, 46(5), 767–774. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.03.014

Shriver, E. R., Young, S. G., Hugenberg, K., Bernstein, M. J., & Lanter, J. R. (2008). Class, race, and the face: Social context modulates the cross-race effect in face recognition. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 34(2), 260–274. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167207310455

Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. New York, NY, US: Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139175043

Smedley, J. W., & Bayton, J. A. (1978). Evaluative race–class stereotypes by race and perceived class of subjects. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 36(5), 530–535. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.36.5.530

Spencer, B., & Castano, E. (2007). Social class is dead. Long live social class! Stereotype threat among low socioeconomic status individuals. *Social Justice Research*, 20(4), 418–432. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11211-007-0047-7

Spencer, S. J., Fein, S., Wolfe, C. T., Fong, C., & Dunn, M. A. (1998). Automatic activation of stereotypes: The role of self-image threat. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24(11), 1139–1152. https://doi.org/10.1177/01461672982411001

Steele, C. (2010). *Whistling Vivaldi: How Stereotypes Affect Us and What We Can Do*. New York, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Swindler Boutte, G. S., Hopkins, R., & Waklatsi, T. (2008). Perspectives, voices, and worldviews in frequently read children's books. *Early Education and Development*, 19(6), 941–962.

Tablante, C. B., & Fiske, S. T. (2015). Teaching social class. *Teaching of Psychology*, 42(2), 184–190. https://doi.org/10.1177/0098628315573148

Tajfel, H. (1969). Cognitive aspects of prejudice. *Journal of Social Issues*, 25(4), 79–97. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1969.tb00620.x

Tajfel, H., Billig, M. G., Bundy, R. P., & Flament, C. (1971). Social categorization and intergroup behaviour. *European Journal Of Social Psychology*, 1(2), 149–178. https://doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2420010202

Tajfel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity of intergroup behavior. In S. Worchel, & W. G. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of intergroup relations* (pp. 7–24). Chicago, MI: Nelson Hall.

Tan, A., Zhang, Y., Zhang, L., & Dalisay, F. (2009). Stereotypes of African Americans and media use among Chinese high school students. *Howard Journal of Communications*, 20(3), 260–275. https://doi.org/10.1080/10646170903065803

Tapia, M. (2010). Untangling race and class effects on juvenile arrests. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 38(3), 255–265. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcrimjus.2010.03.002

Telles, E. E. (2002). Racial ambiguity among the Brazilian population. *Ethnic And Racial Studies*, 25(3), 415–441. https://doi.org/10.1080/01419870252932133

Telles, E. E., & Lim, N. (1998). Does it matter who answers the race question? Racial classification and income inequality in Brazil. *Demography (Pre-2011)*, 35(4), 465–474.

Warner, L. R. (2008). A best practices guide to intersectional approaches in psychological research. *Sex Roles: A Journal of Research*, 59(5–6), 454–463. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-008-9504-5

Warner, L. R., & Shields, S. A. (2013). The intersections of sexuality, gender, and race: Identity research at the crossroads. *Sex Roles*, 68, 803–810. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11199-013-0281-4

Weeks, K., Weeks, M., & Frost, L. (2007). The role of race and social class in compensation decisions. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22(7), 701–718. https://doi.org/10.1108/02683940710820118

Weeks, M., & Lupfer, M. B. (2004). Complicating race: The relationship between prejudice, race, and social class categorizations. *Personality And Social Psychology Bulletin*, 30(8), 972–984. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167204264751

Westie, F. R. (1952). Negro-white status differentials and social distance. *American Sociological Review*, 17, 550–558. https://doi.org/10.2307/2088221

Westie, F. R., & Howard, D. H. (1954). Social status differentials and the race attitudes of Negroes. *American Sociological Review*, 19, 584–591. https://doi.org/10.2307/2087797

Wu, S. J., Bai, X., & Fiske, S. T. (2018). Admired rich or resented rich? How two cultures vary in envy. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Advance online publication. https://doi.org/10.1177/0022022118774943

AUTHOR BIOGRAPHIES

Samantha L. Moore-Berg is a postdoctoral researcher at the University of Pennsylvania and Beyond Conflict Innovation Lab. Her main research interests include 1) isolating cognitive functions that contribute to or predict prejudiced attitudes and subsequent behaviors, 2) investigating how prejudiced attitudes give way to discriminatory behaviors, and 3) designing and implementing prejudice and discrimination reduction interventions. Dr. Moore-Berg received her Ph.D. and M.A. in Social Psychology at Temple University and her B.A. in Psychology and Sociology at Florida State University.

Andrew Karpinski is an Associate Professor of Psychology at Temple University. His research interests include the examination of how the mind works (with a focus on unconscious processes), the measurement of implicit attitudes, and the nature of (primarily unconscious) cognition. Dr. Karpinski received his Ph.D. and M.A. in Social Psychology at the University of Michigan and his B.S. in Psychology and Mathematics at the Ohio State University.